REMARKS

I. Summary of the Examiner's Action

A. Claim Objections

As set forth in paragraph 2 on page 2 of the January 9 Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 19, 26 – 27 and 31 – 32 because of certain informalities.

B. Claim Rejections

As set forth in paragraph 3 on page 4 of the January 9 Office Action, claims 8 and 19 – 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention

As set forth in paragraph 4 at page 7 of the January 9 Office Action, claims 1 – 2, 7 – 8 and 13 – 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,853,639 B1 to Watanuki et al. (hereinafter "Watanuki" or the "Watanuki patent").

As set forth in paragraph 5 at page 8 of the January 9 Office Action, claims 3 – 6, 9 – 12, 15 – 25, 28, 30, 32 – 38, 41 and 44 - 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanuki in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0100325 A1 to Paila et al. (hereinafter "Paila" or the "Paila application").

As set forth in paragraph 6 at page 12 of the January 9 Office Action, claims 26 – 27 and 39 - 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanuki in view of Palia as applied to claims 19 and 32, and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0114302 A1 to McDonald et al. (hereinafter "McDonald" or the "McDondal application").

As set forth in paragraph 7 at page 13 of the January 9 Office Action, claims 29 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanuki in view of Paila and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0023264 A1 to Aaltonen et al. (hereinafter "Aaltonen" or the "Aaltonen application").

As set forth at page 13 of the January 9 Office Action, claims 29 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanuki in view of Paila and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0114302 A1 to McDonald et al. (hereinafter "McDonald" or the "McDonald application").

These rejections are respectfully disagreed with and traversed below.

II. Applicant's Response

A. Claim Objections

Applicant has amended the claims where appropriate. In view of this, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

B. Rejection of Claims 8 and 19 – 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Applicant has amended the claims where appropriate. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner re-read certain of the claims. Applicant submits that certain of the amendments requested by the Examiner to, for example, claim 32 that were not made by Applicant were in error and would have changed the meaning of the claim. Accordingly, Applicant did not effect the amendment. If the Examiner is still not satisfied with the claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner suggest different amendments that do not change the meaning of the claims.

C. Rejection of Claims 1 – 2, 7 – 8 and 13 – 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicant reproduces claim 1 here as a convenience to the Examiner (emphasis added):

> 1. A data communications system comprising a plurality of different networks coupled together by communication links, further comprising at least one multicast agent for coupling a multicast message transmission from a first network to a second network, said at least one multicast agent modifying the multicast message transmission from a first network protocol of the first network to a second network protocol of the

second network, wherein the first network protocol is different from the second network protocol.

Applicant had adopted the amendment suggested by the Examiner. No new matter is added by the amendment. Support for the amendment is found throughout the application as filed.

Applicant's invention is directed to a different problem from that of Watanuki. In particular, Applicant's invention is directed to operate in a hybrid network environment comprised of a combination of IP and non-IP networks as described at page 2 as follows (emphasis added):

> "In a wireless network environment a mobile host may not be attached at all times to the same network, and the existing multicast routing protocols do not address this situation. For mobile services envisioned in the future, many networks may potentially be involved in routing service-related data to mobile hosts. While the existing IP-based multicast routing protocols, such as those referred to above, can be used for routing within IP networks, there is at present no generic mechanism to manage multicast routing in any network. For example, there is currently no generic mechanism to manage the multicast routing of the data sent from the wireless network and routed through an access network, such as a Bluetooth network."

In other words, Applicant's invention is primarily concerned with handling network-level routing of messages between networks operating with differing technologies. Watanuki shows no appreciation for such modes of operation.

Rather, Watanuki is concerned with situations where a message is transmitted at one layer of the OSI network model and is received at a different layer of the OSI model. Accordingly, Watanuki is primarily concerned with conversion between protocols operating at different layers, and not with communications between different networks operating with different technologies as shown by, for example, the following portion appearing at column 3, lines 28 – 42:

> "According to one aspect of the present invention, an information relay device connected between a plurality of logical or physical networks for performing an operation for relay of information between the networks includes a transmit/receive processing unit for receiving a general purpose multicast message from one of the plurality of networks and transmitting a multicast message to at least one of the plurality of networks, and a protocol conversion processing unit for converting, in the case where the general purpose multicast message received by the transmit/receive processing unit is a multicast protocol message of a certain layer, the multicast protocol message of the certain level layer into a multicast protocol message of another level layer."

Applicant respectfully submits that it is not seen where the emphasized subject matter of claim 1 is either described or suggested by the relied-upon reference, whether in this portion or any other portion of the Watanuki patent.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentable over the over the art of record, whether taken singly or in combination. Applicant therefore

respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Applicant also submits that independent claims 7 and 13 are patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1 and for reasons having to do with their independently-recited features. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 7 and 13 be withdrawn as well. Applicant also requests that the rejection of dependent claims 2, 8 and 14 be withdrawn, both since these claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from an allowable base claim, and for reasons having to do with their independently-recited features.

D. Rejection of Claims
under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully submits that Paila is not seen to overcome the deficiency of the Watanuki patent described above. In particular, as described above, Watanuki is concerned with conversion between protocols operating at different layers, and not with routing multicast messages between networks having different technologies. None of Paila, McDonald, Aaltonen or Gupta is seen to remedy this deficiencty of Watanuki.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

Applicant submits that in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn and that the case be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

June 6, 2008
Date

David M. O'Neill
David M. O'Neill (35,304)

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Telephone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245
Email: DOneill@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated.

June 6, 2008
Date

Name of Person Making Deposit